

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Roger Hucks, )  
                  )  
Plaintiff,     )  
                  )  
vs.              )       Civil Action No.: 8:11-cv-470-TLW-JDA  
                  )  
Michael J. Astrue,     )  
Commissioner of Social Security,     )  
                  )  
Defendant.     )  
                  )

---

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Roger Hucks (“plaintiff”), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner” or “defendant”), denying his claim for supplemental security income. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Jacquelyn D. Austin, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. (Doc. # 25). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed pursuant sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and that the case be remanded to the Commissioner for further action consistent with the Report. (Doc. # 25). The defendant filed a reply to the Report, indicating the Commissioner would not file objections to the Report. (Doc. # 27).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. §

636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 25). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and this case is remanded to the Commissioner for further action consistent with the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

July 23, 2012

Florence, South Carolina